

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are pending, Claims 1-3 having been amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 1-5 and 9-11 were rejected as being anticipated by Takahara (U.S. Patent No. 6,628,355, hereinafter Takahara); Claim 2 was rejected as being unpatentable over Takahara in view of Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 5,798,744); and Claims 6-8 were indicated as being allowed.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the identification of allowable subject matter. Applicants have opted not to amend Claims 6-8 in independent form because it is believed that the broader coverage of independent Claim 1, as amended, is justified in view of the asserted prior art.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify features that are believed to have been originally contained in Claim 1, but perhaps not completely appreciated in the Office Action. Amended Claim 1 is directed to a display apparatus, that among other things, includes a plurality of drive circuit substrates arranged on a panel substrate and each having a drive circuit for driving each display element. An area of the panel substrate carrying the display devices are subdivided into a plurality of sub-areas by a plurality of driving lines adapted for driving the display devices. Furthermore, the plurality of the drive circuit substrates are different substrates associated with the sub-areas. Support for the amendment is found in Figures 4 and 7, for example, and therefore no new matter is added. Moreover, as discussed in the specification, beginning at the last line of page 9, separate substrates 3A-3F are subdivided from one another, but are interconnected to one another in a cascaded fashion, but are otherwise distinct substrates.

The present Applicants identified that an advantage associated with having the separate substrates is that it could overcome the problem of conventional devices, where appreciable voltage drops are experienced for large displays (see, e.g., specification, page 3, third full paragraph).

In contrast to this approach, it was the Applicants who were able to identify that by using the subdivision approach, the amount of wiring lengths can be reduced, and therefore the voltage drop due to wiring resistance can be eliminated so as to provide for stable device driving (see, e.g., first full paragraph of page 9).

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Takahara discloses a plurality of drive circuit substrates associated with sub-areas, in Figure 11 and at column 28, lines 15-41. However, as is evident from Figure 11 of Takahara, only one substrate is provided, where the substrate includes common wiring lines 17a-17d. It is clear from Figure 11 that only a single substrate, and not different substrates (or sub-divided substrates) are used. Furthermore, sizeable length wiring lines are provided in Takahara, and thus Takahara would not benefit (of small electrical resistance and associated voltage drop) from the observations made by the present inventors (as reflected in amended Claim 1) for providing a plurality of drive circuit substrates that are different substrates. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1, as well as Claims 2-5 and 9-11 which depend therefrom, patentably define over Takahara.

With regard to Claim 2, Claim 2 is rejected over Takahara in view of Tanaka. Tanaka is asserted for its description of having display devices connected with bumps to the display devices through terminals. However, even if Tanaka does show this feature, this feature in combination with Takahara would fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent Claim 1 (for example there is no teaching or suggestion regarding the separate substrates). Therefore it would not render obvious the invention defined by amended Claim 2.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-11, as amended, is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present invention is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration is therefore requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220



Bradley D. Lytle
Registration No. 40,073

BDL\la

I:\ATTY\BDL\212526US\212526US-AM.DOC